

Plains (9) *Small*
PLAIN
DISCOURSE,
Proving the
DIVINE AUTHORITY
OF THE
Holy Scriptures;

WHEREIN

The late *Bold Attempts* and *Aspersions* of
Jesuits and other *Missionaries* of the Church
of *Rome* are Confuted;

And all their

OBJECTIONS

Against our

English Bible
Are fully and clearly Answered.

By a Reverend Prelate of the Church of *England*.

L O N D O N: Printed, and Sold by *Randall Taylor*, near
Stationers-Hall, 1688.

A. P. L. M. I. N.

DISCOGRAPH

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

To His GRACE
The DUKE of
ORMOND.

May it please Your GRACE,

I Have presumed to Intitle Your Grace to this small Piece, not out of conceit of its Merits, but sense of mine own Obligations. People use to pay their debts as they are able; and when All they can do is in effect Nothing, to have publickly

The Epistle Dedicatory.

acknowledged themselves Insolvent, is, to have aimed at being Just.

May then YOUR GRACE please to Accept of my having intended well, both in the Book and Dedication: And to believe amongst the Numerous Votaries to Your Illustrious Self and Family, he who brings only this mite of Gratitude, has as much Zeal to approve his full Duty, and as industriously watches opportunity to do so, as any man living.

My

The Epistle Dedicatory.

MY LORD,

I shall never fail daily,
till Your GRACE shall be
above such Services, to of-
fer up to that God, whom
You have imitated in *hum-
bling Your self to raise the
poor out of the dust*, my most
cordial Supplications, for
the encrease of Your Glo-
ries and Felicities. The Su-
preme Lord, the *Master of
the whole Family in Heaven
and in Earth*, will repay,
what his poor Menials can-
not, *all the Good* YOUR GRACE
has

The Epistle Dedicatory.

*has done to his House, and
therein, to the unworthiest
of his Vassals,*

Y O U R G R A C E S

Ever Bounden Orator

and Servant,

E. Cork and Rosse.

T H E

P R E F A C E.

WHILE the late Attempts made on Scripture by two or three Persons, of some Learning, but too much Leisure, remained in the Language wherein they were written, I hoped, that for the main, they would only be read by men of Judgment, past the danger of a shock; or at worst by some young Students in the Universities, where the Profound Judgment and Vigilance of those, who preside, would soon stifle any mischief that could proceed from them. But when they began to fly about in English, and
that

The PREFACE.

that even in these remoter parts, into the hands of all sorts, considering how greedily most Men catch at Novelties, what Patience the most curious and delicate Tempers have for Discourses which pretend to Relax the Obligations that some Priests say, lye on Mankind; and withal how great the Number of those, who are, or are ready to be, Tainted, every where is, I could no longer totally temperate either Tongue or Pen.

I thought no Wounds to Religion more dangerous, than those which fall on Scripture; for that these affect the very Vital Fountains of the common Christianity. Hence still my concernment grew on me, which I desire may be admitted in excuse for Exposing this Remedy, how weak soever. It is what for the present I had: I ought not to be want-

The PREFACE.

wanting to my Duty ; and if what I thus have done should prove effectual to the staying up but one Tottering Person , I am assured , the Righteous Judge of all will one day acquit me from the Imputation of having been Impertinent , or over-busie.

My extreme Brevity is from Design, not Sloth. I look upon the Cause I defend, as such, which Pleads its self when once heard, nor needs more words than just suffice to Open it. And besides, I had a mind to Gratifie those, who cannot obtain from themselves Leisure or Patience for perusing Books on this Subject, were they of length proportionable to those they answer.

The Time the Reader adventures on this Discourse is very little, the Argument and Concern very great: and he may without Imposition

The PREFACE.

sition on himself, conclude, such Person must write very ill indeed, who pretending to entertain men for an hour on this Theme, should therein give them occasion to repent of loss of time.

Be pleased therefore to resolve to go through the whole with a placid, free and unbiass'd Mind, and then judge as you list. God guide us all, above Error, and our present Crepuscular Knowledge, into Light and Glories Eternal.

ERRATA.

P*Age 42. line 18. read false.) In---. Pag.*
52. lin. 21. blot out, so absolutely.
pag. 79. lin. 15. and 21. for, xxxviii, read
xlvi. pag. 105. l. 6. r. פתק. p. 121. l. 20.
r. רקרו. p. 122. l. 1. r. רקרו. p. ibid. l. 7. for
Hezekias r. Hefychius. p. 129. l. 10. r. פתק.

A

A

R

d

w

v

h

M

a

H

c

c

S

V

SCRIPTURE
AUTHENTICK,
AND
FAITH CERTAIN.

THE most Sacred sort of §. I.
Oracle, among the *Jews*,
was reputed a voice immediately from Heaven; and therewith was our Saviour own'd several times, and particularly at his Transfiguration on the Mount, *Matt. xvii. 5. & 2 Pet. i. 17.* Then and there, *he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory; This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* With which miraculous attestation

B tion

tion the Apostle *S. Peter*, there comparing the proofs, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and especially the Prophetical ones, gave, of his being the Son of God (the *Messias*, or Saviour of the World) affirms, in the 19th verse, those Scriptures to be the *surer* and stronger evidence of the *two*; and commends the believing *Jews* for attending to them, and admitting them as such. And yet so bold a vein of Scepticism, shall I say, or Atheism, has possess'd some, who would appear to be of the most knowing, if not infallible part of the Christian world, as that it has been publickly contended; and now of late with fresh earnestness, and new-started Pleas some endeavour to justify, that there is no certainty at all in Scripture, especially in that of
the

the Old Testament: and all persons are reproached as fools, illiterate and of short judgment, who pin their Faith on Holy Writ. For neither Original, say some, nor any Version whether old or new, cry others, are to be depended upon. The Language in which the Scriptures were written is lost, the Copies corrupt, the Versions imperfect, and the newest, which some believe to be the exactest, are really, say they, the worst; so that nothing of them must be relied upon: but Tradition (that is, what a Party of cunning men have agreed to tell us) is the only sure foundation of Faith. On occasion of these importunate instances, I crave leave to say, after the Apostle, and speak a few words for the Old *sure word of Prophecy*, and I hope I shall make

it out; that *they do well who take heed thereto.*

§. II. To which purpose I shall endeavour, 1. *Positively to establish the certainty of the Scripture; and chiefly of the Old Testament, or the demonstrative Evidence it bears.* 2. *To answer the new-devised, or fresh-started Objections, against its certainty.* 3. *To lay down such Rules, by which we may from Scripture be certain of our Faith.* And if the conclusion be by urging or *advising* such *practice* as may most naturally comport with the design of the Discourse, it may be hoped the pious Readers patience will not be tired in that last so short Stage.

§. III. And First, That the *word of Prophecy is sure, or the Scriptures*
of

of the *Old Testament* a more demonstrative evidence that Christ was the *Messias*, than was that miraculous voice from Heaven.

For a foundation we will take it for granted (what cannot be denied) that no man of common reason who reads the *Old Testament*, can question, but that these things were explicitly, and as good as in terms, foretold; that the *Messias* should be *born of a Virgin*; that the *place* of his birth should be *Bethlehem*; the *time*, while the *second Temple* was standing; that he should live a most *holy, modest, and humble*, but yet a mean and *despised*, life; that he should make *his soul an offering for sin*; and be *cut off, but not for himself*; that he should *rise again before his body could see corruption*; that he should *ascend into heaven*,

and give gifts to men, (impower fundry sorts of people to supernatural acts, by a miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost;) that some time after this, the City of Jerusalem and the Sanctuary should be destroyed, and desolations were determined upon them; the nation of the Jews should be disperst, and live as vagabonds, and accursed upon the face of the earth. The Original, and generally all Translations agree in these, and such like material Prophecies of the Messias, as these; nor can it be pretended there are such ambiguities of Words, varieties of Senses and Versions, or discrepancies of Copies, that all these, and many other like points predicted of the Messias, are uncertain. Now this being admitted, I say, that these things being thus foretold of Jesus

fus Christ, so many hundred years before his Nativity; and being also exactly verified of him in the fulness of time, the Records which predict them are a greater and surer proof of his being the Son of God, and Saviour of the world, than the miraculous voice from heaven. For,

1. This *Prediction* was no less a §. IV. *miracle* than that immediate voice. By a Miracle we mean, a *sensible effect surpassing the power of nature*: Now what power (especially at such a vast distance of time) could foretel these particularities, but his, by whose counsel they were effected? that is, they were Divine, that is, Supernatural and Miraculous. Besides,

2. These Predictions are a more *publick* and *lasting* Miracle. That

voice was only heard by a few (*Peter, James, and John,*) attested but by three or four witnesses, and transient: This, known to thousands, to myriads, an evident miracle, in actual being to this day, and likely to continue such as long as men shall live on the face of the earth; or, indeed, to survive the world.

3. In these Predictions there is *no possibility of our being*, or of mens pleading that we can be, *imposed upon*. Collusion, Fiction or Mistake, might be at least pleaded in case of the immediate voice: In one instance of it (*John xii. 29.*) the people that heard it, said, it thundered, others that an Angel spake to him: but neither could thunder promulge, nor Angel, either foretel or verifie these things (*1 Pet. i. 12.*) *Angels desired*

to look into these things, but knew them not, till revealed.

In summ then, these predictions being no less a Miracle than that immediate voice upon the Mount, and as a *Miracle* having these three advantages of the other, that they are a *more publick, more lasting, and more unexceptionable* miracle than that, we may say with the Apostle, in having the Scriptures of the *Old Testament*, we have a *more sure word of Prophecy*, than was the Voice from heaven.

And having thus proved the §. v.
certainty of the Old Testament, by way of *Corollary* we may infer the truth of the New. For this containing partly the *History* of the things *predicted*; partly a Scheme of *Doctrine asserted*, in
the

the Old; by reason of its *accord* with the Old, must be *true*, if that be true. At least nothing can be justly pretended against its truth, except the *matter of Fact* should be deny'd, *viz.* that such a person lived as Jesus of *Nazareth*; and that he did such things, and had such things done unto him, as are there recorded. Now as to this, besides the undeniable credit of Histories, there are in being a people disperst over all the world, who profess such a person to have been of their Nation, and that they executed him, and prosecuted his followers, and still execrate both; as indeed we read in those books. Now this matter of fact being admitted, it is sure no power could effect such things for fulfilling of those Prophecies, but that Divine
power

power from whence the Prophecies first came. To predict things hundreds of years before they come to pass, and in pursuance of those Predictions, at such distance to effect them, are both of the same omnipotence: Therefore the *Relations* contained in the New Testament are true: therefore the *historical Records* of them must be *true*, because containing a relation of things truly done, and by the finger of God. And the *Doctrinal* part must be *true*, because according with, and asserted by the Old Testament, which was before proved true. Therefore seeing both Historical and Doctrinal parts are true, the *whole New Testament is a sure word*. We have then (God be blessed) both *a sure word of Prophecy*, and *a sure word of Gospel too*, and *they*
do

do well who take heed thereto.

§. VI. But I conceive I may upon the Apostles authority affirm, they do not so, who imploy their wits and learning to traduce and overthrow the certainty of this sure word of Prophecy. For if the surer be uncertain, what will become of the other? Nay, what of all evidences of Christianity? May I therefore take leave to *answer* the new-form'd (at least *new-trim'd*) *Objections* against the *certainty of the Old Testament*: which it is (therefore) now more necessary to do, because the books that proclaim those Objections to the world are made English, and in the hands of the very common people. The summ of those Objections I may reduce to three heads; the Imputations of *Corruption*;

ruption; of different Readings; and of the none or indeterminate Sense of the Originals.

Objection I. We have not the §. VII.
books of the Old Testament as they were written by the first Authors, but certain pieces, and *contractions* of them, and those too very *mutilate and corrupt.*

Ans. I crave leave to make answer for the Scriptures of the Old Testament out of those of the New. The Apostles pronounced the Scripture as extant in their days, *A surer word of Prophecy* (as we have seen) *given by inspiration of God, able to make men wise unto Salvation, perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works,* (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17.) Now we say, They are *the same at present* as to all substantial points (variations of Spelling

ling and Orthography we are not to account for) as they were then. They then consisted of the *Law, Prophets, and Psalms* or Poetical books (at least) the third part was the כְּתוּבִים or HAGIOGRAPHIA, wherein the Psalms are (*Luke xxiv. 44.*) They consist of the same still; and, as far as can appear, in the self-same order. *Act. xiii. 33. It is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.* These words are in our second Psalm to this day. And again he saith in another Psalm, *thou shalt not suffer thine Holy one to see corruption, v. 35.* these words are in that other Psalm (*viz.*) *Psal. xvi. 10.* And again, *David* himself saith in the book of Psalms, *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool,*

fool, *Luk.* xx. 42. That passage is also in our *Psalms*, and in a *Psal*m inscribed to *David*, as the Author, viz. in *Psal.* cx. Not to instance in more passages, as might be done abundantly.

Besides, it is not credible (as §. VIII. *S. Hierom* in his time, out of *Ori-gen* answered those who objected the falsification of the Old Testament) it is not credible, I say, that our Lord, and his Apostles, who so sharply reprov'd the other crimes and vices of the *Scribes*, and the several Sects of the *Jews*, should have been silent of this, which was the greatest of all (*being false in the greatest DEPOSITUM*) taking from, or corrupting the Divine Oracles committed to their charge. And this Argument though from Negative Au-

Authority, is the more considerable upon the score of *S. Austin's* Doctrine, who gives it as a general Rule, that *where there is a fit place in Scripture to say a thing, if it were so, and it is not said, the argument is good though from Negative Authority, that it is not so.* Now what more fit places can be imagined, than where our Lord appeals to the Scriptures touching his Mission and Doctrine; when he commands his hearers *to search the Scriptures*; when he tells his Disciples and the multitude, *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's seat, and requires them to observe and do what they bid them, but not to do after their works; for they say and do not.* In all appearance what they said as from Moses, or sitting in his seat (*the Scripture as reported or delivered by them*) was genuine

nuin and sincere enough, however vitious their practices were. Who here can imagin, that, had the *Scribes* then (and *Scribes* must do it, or none could) had they, I say, then falsified, corrupted or curtail'd the Scriptures, we should not in some of these and like places have heard of it? Would not some Caution or other have been annext, to this purpose; *Search, but take heed of corruptions* in such a place: Know there are defalcations in such. In a word, and to speak out, Our Lord had not been faithful in the house of God, had he not warned the family, of such an evil. I know a certain Person has pretended to reply to this answer, but his reply is empty and frivolous.

C

Lastly, •

§. IX. Lastly, as to this Objection; I say, 'tis morally impossible since our Saviours time, and indeed for many hundred years before that, that the Scriptures should have been corrupted: for the multitude of Copies was then such, has been since much more such, and so far dispersed, that neither one man, nor one body of men, could ever get them into their hands to corrupt them; and if some few, or many Copies, had been corrupted, but not all, the sincere number would have detected the corrupt. To give a parallel instance, which will easily be understood by all, who can read *English*. Our *English* Bibles, in sundry impressions of this age, are corrupted in *Act. vi. 3. Chuse seven men, whom ye may appoint,*
YE

YE falsly for WE [^{ὅς} καταγήσωμεν,]
 The corruption may be found in
 the later *Edinburgh*, *Cambridge*, and
 since very ordinarily in divers (in-
 deed most) *London Editions*. Now
 this being done, not till the Facti-
 on had crumbled it self into seve-
 ral minute parties, all pretending
 Scripture for their several distin-
 ctive little opinions, 'tis not im-
 probable it might be done at first
 with design, and particularly of
 those, who would establish the
 peoples power, not only in Elect-
 ing, but even in Ordaining, their
 own Ministers. Mean while let
 it be done by whom it might,
 Take an *Edinburgh Edition* of
 1636. a *Cambridge* one of 16 . a
London one of 1642. being it was
 not possible for the Faction to get
 all these Copies and a multitude
 more in, as being so vastly nume-

rous ; the true old Copies examined and compared, discover the Variation from them, that is, the Corruption ; and a more Authentick one than any of them, that is, the Original Greek, if any doubt remain, decides the whole Controversie. In like manner, there were amongst the *Jews*, even in our Saviour's days, and much more since, a vast number of Copies of the Old Testament (for they read in their Synagogues every Sabbath day both Law and Prophets (*Act. xiii. 27, & xv. 21.*) wherefore besides what they had for private use, they must at least have as many publick Books as Synagogues, and Synagogues they had divers in every City. ('Tis incredible, almost, what their Authors report of the number of Synagogues in *Jerusalem* it self) And there

there were amongst them several Sects too, and Scribes of every Sect, all sufficiently watching over one another, had there been any false dealing of this kind. Nay, the very Ten Tribes upon their Seceſſion, and, in probability, much more after their diſperſion, had Copies of the Law, to which we owe the preſent Samaritan-Hebrew Text. But it is certain the *Jews* and *Samaritans* were mortal enemies; would not eat, converſe, diſcourſe together. Now that all their ſeveral Sects and Synagogues, that theſe two laſt named adverſe and mutually incenſed Nations, ſhould conſpire to bring all their Copies together, to vary or corrupt them all alike, and the world never hear of this combination, and the reconcilement of the Parties in order thereunto, is

not morally possible. But if all were not brought together and altered alike, as before said, one must convince another of falshood. And there being, as shall be presently made out, no Variations of any considerable moment betwixt the Copies of the Old Testament, which we now have in common use, and the most antient or sincere ones, that can be produced, (at least none having made it appear there is any such Variation) but in the stead thereof a marvellous agreement, there can be no such corruption, as the Objection pretends. And this brings us to the

§. X. *Second Objection.* There are in the *Hebrew* Originals actually produced, say some, *different Readings*, and both cannot be true, (for
truth

truth is but one) therefore the one of them must be corrupt.

Answ. There are indeed *different Readings*, and some too, as pretended, from famed *different Traditions*. *Rabbi Ascher* setting up one way, and *R. Naphthali* another: and from them the *Oriental Jews* observing one *Lecti*on, the *Occidental* another. And all these are collected by diverse, and particularly are now extant in the *Appendix* to the *English Polyglott*. But yet all these Diversities make only a great noise, are indeed of no considerable importance. For the instances of Diversity are such as no one, but a superstitious *Jew*, or some person who had a mind to unsettle foundations, and for want of Arguments were concern'd to catch at any shadows of Probability, would contend about

C 4

them.

them. They are such mighty matters as these; Whether the same word should be written with a long *E* or a short *A*; whether another should be written with their longest *O*, or with one somewhat shorter; whether it should have an Accent of this kind, or of that; whether a supernumerary (which they call a Quiescent) letter should be written, or whether, being it might without damage be spared, it should be omitted.

Not much unlike hereto is also the noise made with what they call the *Keri* and the *Ketib*, that is, the *Marginal* and the *Textual Reading*: as if there were some great repugnancy betwixt these: Whereas, in brief, the *thing*, or *matter*, is still the same in both, the *manner of expression* a little different. And this occasioned partly

ly by the Superstitious modesty of some Rabbies, putting into the Margin certain words, which they thought more honourable to be read, instead of some other broader term in the Text [as, 2 *Kings* xviii. 27. they would not read it *Pisse*, but the *water of their feet*, forsooth] partly by reason of some letters, or words, dubiously written in some venerable antient Copies, and so variously read. From which Antient Copies, out of reverence, they would vary nothing in transcribing, but copying the text exactly and entirely as they found it, that which was by the most learned, in ages of old, judged the more correct reading, they put in the Margin, and called it *Keri*. So that the sum of the difference is, 'tis one way in some Copies, 'tis otherwise in others; and
which

which way soever we take, the matter is of no great moment; we have liberty without danger to take either reading, which pleaseth us best. Now, under favour, such *various readings* as these, are not Arguments of the Scriptures corruption, but of *Gods Providence and Humane industry* to *preserve Scripture from corruption*. And in conclusion of this point, I may boldly aver, there is not one *Article either of Faith, or Christian practice, concern'd* in all the *various Hebrew Lections* in the World. The knowledge of them, to use the Rabbinical phrase, is only an *Hedge about the Law*: and our care to read aright, in matters of the smallest concern, keeps us from reading amiss in the greater.

The

The *Third Objection* is, The *Original is insignificant*: For, besides that *None*, no not the very *Jews* themselves, *can read it*; the words of that Language are *Equivocal*, and so the *Translations all vain*, and not to be credited; as being taken from an Original, which is in a manner whatsoever people will make it, and much different from what it was, as used by our Lord and his Apostles, while on earth.

To be as brief and distinct as may be in Answer to this Objection, as to its several parts:

First, It is a pleasant thing to §.XII.
perswade men they cannot read, when actually they do read, and themselves know, and others hear them so to do: Or, that now of old that way of Reading has been
lost,

lost, which yet has been transmitted as all Ordinary Arts are (but with infinitely more care) from hand to hand, by people who have in their Generation made it their whole business (as to this day many *Jews* do) meerly to read and write their Law. It is sure, and some of the fiercest of our Contradictors confess, the *true way of reading* was *known* in *Origen's* time: for he transcribed the Hebrew text, both in Hebrew Characters, and exprest again, as well as it could be, in Greek letters into his *Hexapla*. It was known in *Hierom's* time: For he had that *Hexapla*, and amended his Copy of it by the more Authentick one in the Library of *Cæsarea*; and out of the Hebrew text, by help of that Copy, made his Translation. Thus, for at least

400 years after Christ, we are, as I think it must be acknowledged, secure. About the year 1000 at furthest, if not sooner, all men confess the Tradition of the present reading to have been in use, and sithence, at least, to have been currant in the world, by the industry of the *Masorites* of *Tiberias*. In the interval then of 600 years, this the old Art of Reading must be lost, and a new one invented, by that people whose Original native Language this Hebrew was. Which negligence first, and afterwards most laborious Artifice of the *Jews*, how improbable it is, especially seeing we have left to us the several Prophecies, at least so many several Prophecies of the *Messias*, and of the *Jews* dealing with him, so intire in the text, even against the supposed inventors

tors themselves; is so notorious that I need not speak. Besides, what cause, or even appearance and likelihood of any cause, can in any History be shewn, why in that Period of time, rather than any other, the *Jews* should lose the Reading of their Language? Indeed considering, that their Law, that is, their Religion, was written in this Language, considering they ever were, and to this day are, a Nation so stubbornly tenacious of their Religion and Law; considering, lastly, that no small numbers amongst them, as just now was said, made the Reading and Copying of their Law, the business of their life, (did so in our Saviours time, have done so since) it is not credible, the Reading of it should in that period have been lost: And if not then lost, never. Secondly,

Secondly, As to *Hebrew words* §. XIII.
having *several significations*, 'tis
very sure some of them have : but
so have the words in all *Langua-*
ges, which are known to have
been commonly spoken upon the
face of the Earth ; at least 'tis no-
torious the same may be said, of
either *Greek* or *Latin*. And we
know, even in them, as well as in
the more modern *Lingua's*, we are
daily put to it, from the scope of
the discourse, and the juncture of
some words with other, &c. to de-
termin the true acceptation or
sense. Which in our Translating
the Hebrew text, if we cannot do,
we ordinarily set down both, or
all the senses, one in the Text and
the other in the Margin of our
Translations. So that this is no
just plea, either against the He-
brew,

brew, or our Translations thereof: We may take the Hebrew, where dubious, in all the senses it will bear: and our Translations (the modern ones especially, and above others, the *English*) set down the several senses. So does not the Septuagint (however highly contended for by some) which always confines us to one of the several senses, and sometimes misses all of them. In a word, our Translations have, or may have, all the Senses the present Originals can bear, and besides them, any which Antient Versions or Glosses can probably affix to the Originals. But it is to be feared, some men are enemies, for Enmities sake.

§.XIV. Thirdly, As to the *difference* pleaded betwixt our *present Reading*, and what is pretended to have

have been our *Saviour's* and his *Apostles rendring* the *Hebrew text*, this may indeed stumble or gravel some who do not consider the following particulars. (1.) That it is a *great mistake* to say, our *Lord himself made use of the Septuagint*, or, as far as can be proved, any other *Greek Version* imaginable; because the Authors of the Scriptures of the New Testament have done so. For he being by Nation a *Jew*, and preaching only *to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, as being an *Apostle of the Circumcision* (according to *S. Paul's* term of him) certainly spoke the Language of the then *Jews*, and preached to them therein; which haply, though not strictly *Hebrew*, was yet a *Dialect* of it, namely, *Syriack*. And this appears from a multitude of passages

D spo-

spoken by him, extant in the Greek Testament without change, as often as those Authors thought fit to record the numerical syllables uttered by him: such are *Racha*, *Mammon*, *Corban*, *Cephas*, *Barjona*, *Talitha Kumi*, *Ephphatha*, *Eli Eli lamma sabañani*, &c. Therefore he in his ordinary preaching, made no use of the Septuagint. And it is most plain from *Acts* vii. 2. &c. and from *ch.* xxi. 40. and from diverse other places, that the Apostles, and their Adjutants, when they preached to the *Jews*, used the Hebrew tongue, that is, the Language then common to the *Jews*, called, as a-fore suggested, in a large sense, Hebrew. And when they preached to others, they had nothing to do to alledge Scripture, much less therefore then did they use Greek Versions.

There-

Therefore neither did the Apostles, even in their ordinary preaching to the *Jews*, ordinarily use the Septuagint. (2.) The main body of the Jewish Nation persisting in infidelity, and the Gospel designing the Call of the *Gentiles*, it was necessary the New Testament should be written in another Language than that wherein either the Doctrine of the Old, was first recorded, or the Doctrine of the New, as we have seen, at first, preached: and the *Greek* being then, and in that part of the world, the most *universal language*, was the fittest for this purpose. On this occasion was the New Testament written in Greek. Now the Old Testament having been before known to have been publickly made *Greek*, by a Council of LXXII *Jews*, (the

number of the Elders in a great *Sanhedrim*) who by the way designed no strict Translation, but rather such a Paraphrastical one as might best recommend their Law and Nation to Foreigners ; the Authors of the New Testament finding that Version sufficiently clear, true, and exact for their purpose, chose often times to make use of that, as being known, and in all mens hands, and confest by all to contain the body of the Jewish Religion, rather than to translate a-new, according to strictness, which would have been disputed and contradicted. And on this account the Septuagint, or old Greek Translation, was used so *often* by the Penmen of the New Testament. *So often*, I say ; for those who bear the World in hand that the Septuagint

tuagint Version is ** always* observed by the Authors of the New Testament, or even by the Evangelists themselves, it is to be feared, are abused persons, or have not been at pains to examine the particulars. For, it is evident to all persons of consideration and diligence in such studies, that these Sacred Authors took a ** latitude*, contenting themselves with the general sense of the Text, not servilely following words: of which, would this Discourse admit, I would give (and possibly hereafter shall subjoin) instances numerous enough.

** See the Appendix to this purpose, A.*

** See Appendix, B.*

In the mean while (3.) That *any Translation* should be of *more Authority* than the *Original*, and the *Original* as *prior*, so not *derive Authority* to the *Translation*, is a piece of sense only becoming such

D 3 Doctors,

Doctors, who scorn all mens reasons but their own, or are resolved to set up their own Authority without reason. If a Record, Decree, or Sentence were to be produced, translated into another Language than that wherein it was conceived, it would certainly be adjudged of so much the more validity, by how much more strict accord it could be proved to have with the Original. And the same being to be concluded of all Translations in like cases, the *Hebrew text* must, for that reason, be of *more Authority* than the *Septuagint*, or *any other Translation* of, or from it self.

§. XV. But that which must for ever take off the force of this part of the Objection is, (4.) that the *New-Testament-reading* of any
Texts,

Texts, which are taken out of the Old, does, if duly examined, at the *last result*, and in effect, *accord with the Old*; and however different the words appear, the sense is coincident, and the matter comes to the same pass. I will instance in a Text of importance, wherein, at first sight, the sense seems very different, yet upon a little consideration, proves, as to matter, the same. It is, *Psal. xl. 6*. We read, *David* there, in the person of Christ, thus addressing himself to God, *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, &c. but mine ears hast thou opened* [*Digged*, saies the Margin, or rather *Bored*.] *Then said I, lo I come, &c. to do thy will, O Lord*. This the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, following the (Modern Editions, probably, not the Antient Version of the) *Septuagint*, reads,

D 4

But

But a body hast thou prepared me,
Now Opening, Digging or Boring
ears, and Preparing a Body, seem
at first widely distant Notions:
but in regard of our Lord's *in-*
carnation and *obedience to death,*
even the death of the Cross, (the
subject he had in hand) they are
in effect much identick or equi-
valent. In other terms, " That I
" might in all things accomplish
" and be obedient to thy will,
" thou hast framed me an Or-
" ganised body, in which particu-
" larly thou hast made me passa-
" ges for the receiving (or hear-
" ing) thy commands; that is,
" thou hast digged or bored my
" ears. Framing of ears was a
part of framing the body, and so
Synecdochically the same. And
he had reason rather to take that
part of formation, than any other,
for

for the whole, because he designed thereby to express prophetically the *Messias's* quickness and promptness to Obedience, and offering himself up upon the Cross. Or otherwise; *Mine ears hast thou bored*, that is, “according
“to the Ceremony of perpetuating mens services, thou hast,
“by my free consent and voluntary proposition, taken me as
“thy Servant, which that I might
“be, it was necessary I should take
“the form of a Servant, the Humane Nature: wherefore thou
“hast prepared me a body, which
“I may offer in obedience to thy
“will. The preparing the Son a body was as plain a Testification that he was made a Servant, as to the ordinary Menial was the Boring of the Ear. By either of these short Paraphrases (others have
made

made larger) we see the discrepancy is naturally removed, either phrase being the same in effect, and both pertinent to the scope or design of the whole Paragraph. And the like accommodation might be made of other seemingly discordant passages, would the bounds of this discourse permit.

§.XVI. To put into one, all which has been said to this last Objection. The summ of our Answer is: Our Saviour and his Apostles, in their ordinary preaching to the *Jews*, used not the Septuagint, (part therefore of what our Adversaries object is false) in the Penning of the Gospel or New Testament ; because a then received, though not exact, Version, was [*Argumentum ad Homines*] a fit

fit proof to many of that age and people, and would, besides, serve well enough for all in general; the Version of the Septuagint was used ordinarily, and yet very * frequently deserted. (There is therefore still more falsity in our Adversaries clamours.) But it were Non-sense to infer hence, as some do, that therefore the Septuagint is more Authentick than the Hebrew, that is, a Translation than its Original. Besides, after all this coil, the authority both of Old Testament and New stands firm, above the attempts of its enemies, Wit, Learning or Malice. For generally in both, the Sense is the same, the way of expressing only different. The Old Testament, as extant in our *English* Bibles is translated Grammatically, or, in a manner, word for word:

* See
herein
the Ap-
pendix,
A.

word: What is produced out of the Old, in the New Testament, is often a Paraphrase of the Original text, as being translated from a kind of *Greek* Paraphrase (rather than a simple Version) commonly called the Septuagint, and thence arises that seeming discrepancy.

I conclude therefore, upon the whole, the Scriptures of the Old Testament to be a sure word of Prophecy, notwithstanding those loud imputations of Corruptions, of various Readings, of None or Indeterminate sense: All which imputations, for the main, are false; and where they are not, affect not any considerable substantial part of Scripture (that is, of DIVINE VERITY) or point of Christian Faith and Practice. And the same by the premises is
con-

conclusible also of the New Testament: Therefore Scripture is Authentick.

It remains now in the next §.XVII. place to propound terms, on which we may be *ascertained* of our *Faith* from the Scriptures, which have been thus proved to be sure: And they shall be very brief, few and reasonable terms, which I will propound.

The first Article shall be, *That in all controverted points of Faith,* (for there are points of Faith, at least points which some men obtrude on our Faith, that are controverted and rejected too, very commonly and justly :) I say, that in such controverted points of Faith, *That doctrine, wherein both Originals and Translations generally agree, whether in a deep silence or*

a contradiction thereof, be adjudged either spurious or no point of Faith. This will at once strike off all the new Articles of the Tridentine Creed, (I mean, the Creed framed from the Decrees of the Council of Trent) together with all Doctrines favoured there, though not expressly decreed for Faith, but since improved and received as Faith by the Romanists. And particularly, the Popes Infallibility will be gone: for if Scripture had asserted Infallibility to any Vicegerents of God on earth, it would be to Kings, not to Popes, Prov. xvi. 10. A Divine Sentence is in the lips of the King, his mouth transgresseth not in judgment. Which text, though it manifestly restrain it self to the Administration of Civil justice (wherein none of our Church ever thought of any Appeal from

a Royal Decree, or in any other case of resistance to the Royal Authority;) yet doth it suppose a more generally infallible conduct and superintendency of God's Providence over the Decrees of Kings, than is any where in Holy Scripture asserted over the Sentences or Determinations of any other Judges on Earth in any cause whatsoever. And I would fain see produced from any part of Holy (yea even of Apocryphal) Writ, so fair and expresse a Text, for an Infallibility of Popes, or any other on Earth: But this by the bye.

Secondly, I propound only further, *That whatsoever, Originals and Translations generally agree in asserting as necessary to be believed or done, in order to Salvation, be admitted as such.* And I am sure then,

then, the *whole Doctrine* (both of *Faith* and *Practice*) of the *Protestants* stands establisht. For our *Foundation* is *Scripture*, and that *interpreted by the Universal Tradition* of the Church in its *first and purest ages*, even when the boldest Adversaries we have dare not say, those corruptions of Scripture, of which now they make so clamorous pretences, were in being: and in Scripture our Foundation is not dubious Texts, perplext with Criticisms, uncertain by various Readings, suspected for Corruptions, Interpolations, &c. but plain, expresse, undoubted and repeated ones. And as long as our Foundation thus is Scripture, if that be a sure Word, our Faith is sure.

Whe-

Whether then some men dispute against Scripture, meerly out of wantonness, and to shew their Learning, or for other ends, it concerns not us to enquire. But both they, and all our Enemies, must know, 'tis past time of day, to put us out of conceit with our Bibles, or to perswade them out of our Hands or Hearts. *Græcum est, non potest legi*, might down in *Monkish ages*, it will *not now*; no not even with those whom some disdainfully (and with a greater pride than is due to the Merits of their own Learning) call *Laicks*. And God be blessed for this glorious Light. Upon the whole therefore, We remain sure both of our Scriptures, and of our Faith.

E

And

§.XIX.

And here, by the way, I must take the liberty to say, *All other imaginable ways* of making us *sure of our Faith*, without Scripture, in the present state of things, are *idle and vain*. And whatever carries any plausible pretence of certainty, will, at length, resolve it self into this of Scripture. There has been a long time, and still is, a great cry in the world about *Tradition*: But if we look into the case, it is not *Tradition* (that is, the *Constant consent of the Antient and Catholick Church*) which the *Romanists* have to vouch for their present *Traditions* [or *peculiar Doctrines*] but the late *corrupt use*, and bold *say-so* of their Church. Thus in the Council of *Trent*, when the Evidence of any of these their new
(at

(at least comparatively new) Doctrines had been sifted, and could be found, neither in Scripture, nor Fathers, or any anti-ent Councils; it was but saying the point was so held or practised by the Church, and the Church was Infallible; therefore being the Church taught it, it must be *an Apostolick Tradition*, though not extant in Scripture: and so whatever they pleased to give this venerable name to, was thereby presently dub'd an Article of Faith.

And particularly thus was the matter carried, in the question of the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, of the present *Canon of the Mass*, of the *Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction*, in the *Interdict of Priests marriage*, not to name more points of like nature. For

if indeed, truly named, that is *Universal Tradition* [*Quod ubiq; quod semper, quod ab omnibus, &c.*] were the thing urged upon us, we are and ever have been as much for it as any men. To this day we cry; Let us go to tryal, on this issue, in the name of God. But such Tradition as this, we shall find, amongst all the controverted points, only for Scripture. I will be bold to say, we have not so unvariable Tradition for the *Articles of the Creed*, which we call the *Apostles Creed*, as we have in behalf of the *Books of the Old and New Testament*. So that according to these measures, we are but where we were before. Universal Tradition must prescribe our Faith, and so absolutely Universal Tradition we have for no point controverted, but for the
Orig-

Original Scriptures, nay, indeed, scarcely for any other point of Faith so uniformly. Original Scripture therefore, as before, still stands unshaken.

But these Rules, will some say, §. xx. are for *Learned men*, who understand, and can search Originals, compare Versions, and see where in they agree: What shall the unlearned *Common people* do? I say still, *Keep to your English Translation*, good people: *keep to what you are*. Your *English Bibles* to you, are the *surest word of Prophecy and Gospel* too, that you can meet with. The *Translation* of the *Old Testament* has been confest by Foreigners, of excellent judgment [*usque ad invidiam aliarum gentium elaborata*] Accurate even to the envy of other Nations: That of the

E 3 Gospels

Gospels is no less so: especially taking in the Margin. And though it were to be wisht, the *Epistles* had been translated with that strictness according to the letter, and so unbyast judgment, with which the other parts of our Bibles are; yet this may be said even as to them; What the Text has less exact (according to the Original) or dubious, not only the Margin, but the very *different Character* of several words in the Text, directs to a genuin or wholesome sense of. My meaning is, whereas it is not possible to translate Hebrew or Greek into English strictly word for word, and to make such translation sense (the Idiom or propriety of the languages so vastly differing, that we must in English put in several particles or little words to make good

good sense with us) all those words so put in, or supplied, are printed ordinarily in a different sort of letter from the rest; by which means we may easily discover any word that is not in the Original, and from such discovery know, what weight to lay upon that text so translated. So that there is no danger of peoples miscarrying in their Faith, who humbly and soberly keep to their English Bibles, which God be blessed now we have extremely cheap and frequent in our hands. Only the people are here to be minded in case of doubts, to have recourse to their spiritual Guides.

By these means then we are, or may be, as sure of our Faith from Scriptures, as we are of the Scriptures themselves.

§. XXI. Now, To put a due *Conclusion* to this Discourse; there are some *Christian Practices*, which the scope of it does naturally recommend, and *some advices* which it may *occasion*.

And First, Let the reflexion on what has been discoursed touching the certainty of Holy Scriptures, and their Authentick Verity, raise in our hearts a due *Esteem* and *Cordial Reverence* of them, as not being from Man, nor, meerly, by man, but *given by inspiration of God*, and in a peculiar and marvellous manner, preserved and *transmitted by his special Providence* from age to age, through multitudes of hands down to us, who live probably near the end of time. It
was

was once the great priviledge of the *Jews*, that to them *were committed the Oracles of God*: that priviledge is now common to us, with them. Though perhaps therefore we may not keep those Oracles with so superstitious a care and curiosity as they did; yet let us both keep, and treat them with as *cordial adherence*, and as *awful esteem*. But especially, let us take care that we use not passages out of them, in our ordinary discourse, slightingly, in Jest and Drollery, to create Laughter to our selves and others. Holy things should not be plaid with: and we are to remember, that if we do play with them, we teach people to think we do not believe them to be Holy.

Secondly,

Secondly, Let not *a Prize* be put into our hands, and we such fools as not to have hearts to use it. Have we the *Word of Prophecy*, surer than other Miraculous Revelation; Have we the *Gospel of Truth* too, both mutually confirming and confirmed by one another, and shall we be so idle and gross, as to be any of us in a manner incapable of using either? Why should there be a person in a Christian Church or Nation, to whom the Holy Scripture should be as a Book sealed, who should know no more, by the Book open and laid before him, than if fast closed up; I mean who should not be able, himself to read, the glad tidings and terms of his Salvation? Good people, deny not your selves that, which an excellent Person has
most

most justly stiled, the CHRISTIANS BIRTH-RIGHT, the use of Holy Scriptures. Take care and endeavour, that both you and yours be able to read. And being so, whatever Book you read not through, or rarely look into, let not the Bible be that neglected one. Rather account such a day lost, in which you have not attentively and considerately read some part thereof.

Thirdly, Remember him who said, *Hold fast till I come, that no man take thy Crown.* He sits at the right hand of his Father, ready to give it, and will in good time come and give it us, if we faint not,

And Lastly, As most excellent means to insure to our selves a right use of Scriptures, and to
pre-

preserve us from misinterpreting or misapplying them, let us be careful of the two following particulars.

First, To furnish our minds with a *form of sound Doctrine*, gathered out of Holy Scripture. This, it is to be hoped, we had in some degree in our early years by *Catechism*, and without this, both Scripture and Sermons are in a great measure unserviceable. It is the Apostle's Rule, that they who *Prophecie* (that is in the New Testament notion of Prophesying, interpret Scripture) do it *according to the proportion of Faith*, Rom. xii. 6. his meaning seems to be, that understanding, first, the several Articles of Christian Faith, we should interpret or take Scripture in consistency there-

therewith. This rule will prevent the abuse of Holy Scripture to Errour and Novelty.

Secondly, To endeavour the *Honest and Impartial practice* of what we know, in the fear of God, and as we shall answer the not Doing according to our Lords will, when we have known That his will. This most assuredly will prevent Scriptures being useless; and besides will both lead us to an higher pitch of knowledge, and secure us from any dangerous Errours. For amongst *other parts of Christian duty*, we shall then practice *Meekness, Humility*, and a low conceit of our selves: we shall not therefore too much lean to our own understanding, we shall not exceed our own measures; And then (Psal. xxv. 9, 14.)

The

The meek will the Lord guide in judgment, the meek will he teach his way. The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew them his Covenant.

These are the great Uses we should make of this sure Word of *Prophecy, Law and Gospel*, to value and reverence it; in testimony thereof, to capacitate not only our selves, but all ours, by moderate, at least, the lowest degree of Learning (being able to read) to make use of it, and then diligently to read it, and hold it fast: But especially by getting into our minds a form of sound words (a due understanding Catechetical doctrine) and by living according to what we know, to ensure to our selves the right use of it.

And

And if we thus take heed to this sure word, 'tis sure we shall do well: We shall be *sure* not only of *our Faith*, but of the *End of it* too; We shall be certainly and unspeakably rewarded in Glory and Bliss everlastingly.

Which God grant, &c.

F I N I S.

[illegible]

1911

37

APPENDIX.

CHAP. I.

IT is not at all the Design of the following Papers to expose or vilifie the Greek Translation of the Old Testament, made by LXXII Elders of the *Jewish* Nation near three hundred years before Christ, and commonly called the Septuagint; but rather to leave it in the possession of what is its just and undoubted right, the First and Highest place amongst all the Antient Versions. Only reserving, in the mean while, and Asserting, to the Original Hebrew its precedency, as well in

F Auth o-

Authority as Age; and consequently, to all modern Translations from it, & degree of Authority proportionable to their Accord with it; both which (I mean the Hebrew Original, and modern Translations) have been strangely trampled upon by some, in their undue carriere of zeal for the Septuagint.

The great Argument they urge, is the Use, which the Pen-men of the New Testament make of the Septuagints Version, in those Texts which they produce out of the Law and the Prophets. Boldly they have affirmed, that *the Evangelists, Apostles, and the whole Christian Church by perpetual consent have acknowledged the Truth of the Septuagints Version*: And hence they would infer, that *no where of right we may depart from it.*
Nay,

Nay, not only all of the present Age, who prefer the Original to it, but even *S. Hierom* himself is severely censured for so doing, and *the Authority of any one of those Seventy Interpreters* (for it is supposed that some single persons of them came several times into *Egypt*, and translated the Prophets and *Hagiographa*, the whole LXXII having at first translated only the Pentateuch:) the Authority, I say, of any single person of those Elders is avowed of greater credit than all the Synagogues of the Jews since that time, or all the Learning of the Rabbies their Followers.

This Argument I have in effect denied: and on the contrary, Truly I have affirmed, (s. 14.) "That the Sacred Pen-men of the New Testament, have not always fol-

“lowed the Septuagints Version,
“that they very commonly take
“a Latitude, and content them-
“selves with the general sense of
“the Text, not indeed following
“either that, or any other Versi-
“on, that we know of, then ex-
“tant. And *hence I would infer,*
that the Authority of the Sep-
tuagint is not so Sacred as these
men pretend, it having not so
constant Vouchers as asserted;
nay, it being left oftner by the
Evangelists than followed; and
especially left, in most of
those Texts, which, by peculiar
circumstances, prove our Jesus to
have been the true Messias; which
Texts, in the present Septuagint,
are for the most part vitiously
rendred, but in the Original He-
brew are intire, and clear as the
Sun: In fine, that the Original
there-

therefore is to be acknowledg'd the only Authentick Old Testament.

Now, because I will not, as some, expect to be believed upon my meer saying so: for a Tryal of the truth herein, we will take, at a venture, the ten first Texts, by each Evangelist reported out of the Old Testament, and collating them, both with the Septuagint and the Hebrew, as we shall find them, in particular, to accord with or recede from each or either, we will for the present make a more general Estimate. I could willingly have taken more, but these will suffice to try an ordinary Reader's Patience, as well as give us a proof what we might expect in the rest, were all examined.

And for more clear proceeding herein, let it in the first place be

granted, or supposed, that where the Phrase, or principal Terms, in any Text are altered, however the same sense be still kept, there the Translation of such Text is not the same. For if both Phrase and Sense should be altered, it would no longer be a different Translation, but different Text. The alteration therefore of the Phrase, or of the principal Terms, is sufficient to warrant the name of a different Translation.

This being taken for a Foundation, the Propositions which we are to prove, are distinctly these two :

I. That the Evangelists do not always follow the Septuagints Translation.

And for clearer casting up the account, let this Proposition be known by the letter *A*.
So

So that where ever it stands in the Margin, there may be observed an instance of this Propositions being verified.

II. That they used a Liberty, or took a Latitude, not following ever the expressions of any other known Translation, or indeed of the Original it self, but contenting themselves generally to report (sometimes only to allude to) the Sense of such or such Texts, as they had occasion to make use of. And let not this be thought the worse of, because it was of old S. *Jerome's* doctrine, who may be thought a party: *The holy Apostles and Evangelists*, saith he, *commonly alledge Testimonies out of the Old Testament, according to the Sense, not the Words:*

as indeed do the Fathers, and most Writers, out of all Authors.

And, as the other, let this Proposition be known by its letter, *viz.* B. And further, because upon this Enquiry there will arise matter of fact, which will prove other Propositions, to be treated of anon, all tending to vindicate the Authority of the present Hebrew Text (which I contend to be the Original, and alone Authentick) for the better making up our account, therein, also, let C signify the single Concord of the Evangelists and Septuagint: but CC the Concord of all three, Hebrew, Septuagint and Evangelists: and † Texts perverted in the Septuagint. And

And now in the name of God, let us examine all without Prejudice or Partiality, not solicitous for Victory but Truth.

CHAP. II.

Texts produced out of the Old Testament by S. Matthew.

THE first Testimony S. Matthew alledges out of the Old Testament, is from *Isai. vii. 14.* This in the Hebrew runs (strictly enough according to our Translation) *Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel.* In the Septuagint it runs thus, *Behold a Virgin shall receive in her womb, and* then word for word, as in the Hebrew. But in the Greek of the

the New Testament, *Behold a Virgin shall have* [or carry] *in her womb*, which sense our Translators in the New Testament, *Matth. i. 23.* well express, *shall be with child*. I say, to conceive, and to be with child, Ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάτειν & ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν, are different Phrases, if not things; and of more signification, perhaps, here, than at first thought of. Had our Lord according to the opinion of the old *Valentinians*, or later *Menno-nites* in Germany, had only a Celestial body, which meerly passed through the *Virgin Mary*, not being formed of her substance; she might have been said to have received it in her womb: But ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν, *to be with child*, being according to common use of the Phrase, properly of Women, who are truly gravid, does more emphati-

phatically assert the Verity of our Lord's Humane Nature, by implying his being carried the full time in the womb; and therefore that his body was nourished, and consequently formed of his blessed Mothers substance, which ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν does not. And it may be no wrong to the Holy Ghost, to conceive he guided S. *Matt.* thus in Greek to word his Text, rather than as the Septuagint do. But besides this variation, whereas the Septuagint, keeping close to the Hebrew, have it, *Thou shalt call*, namely, *Thou, O Virgin, shalt call*, קראת S. *Matthew* here also recedes, and that from both, saying, *They shall call*. And in truth, in the former point, he may be thought, also, to have a little left the Hebrew, as well as Septuagint: for, to receive in the womb, which was the

the Septuagints phrase, more properly expresses what we mean by *Conception*, than *being with child*.

- A. In short, his receding from the Septuagint in these two points, is a proof of the first Proposition;
B. his receding both from Septuagint, and from Hebrew, a proof of the second.

The second Allegation by S. *Matthew* is out of *Micah* v. 2. which is again very well, and naturally, translated from the Hebrew, in our Bibles, thus, *Thou Bethlehem-Ephratha, though thou be little amongst the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel*. The Septuagint here render it, *Thou Bethlehem the house of Ephratha art the least, &c.* In the rest, nearly enough to the Hebrew. But S. *Matthew*, especially
in

in his Greek, recedes from both strangely: *Thou, O Bethlehem, the land of Judah, art in no wise the least amongst the Princes of Judah, Matth. ii. 6.* Besides the Variation, here is a plain contradiction to the Septuagint. [*Ὀυδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, Matth. Ὀλιγοὶς εἶ τῷ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰούδα. Sept.*] greater difference both in Sense and Phrase cannot well be. And in the latter member, excepting the contradiction, the variation is not much less. *For out of thee shall come forth a Ruler* [*ἡγεμὼν, Matth. τῷ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, Sept.*] *Who shall feed my people Israel.* Except the proper names, here is nothing alike. What, in the name of God, did he think, who asserted a *perpetual consent*?

A.

B.

The third Old Testament text is *Hosea xi. 1.* which we render
faith-

faithfully, word for word, out of the Hebrew, thus: *Out of Egypt have I called my son.* But the Septuagint, *I have sent for his children out of Egypt.* S. Matth. ii. 15. agrees exactly with the Hebrew, the Septuagint being as foreign to his purpose, as it is to the Original.

A fourth Text is out of *Jerem.* xxxi. 15. in which again the faithfulness of our Translators to the Hebrew, as well as to S. Matthew, is to be commended: *In Ramah was there a voice heard, Lamentation and weeping and great mourning, [Lamentation and weeping of bitterness, Hebr.] Rachel mourning for her children, and [refused, Hebr.] would not be comforted, because they were not, Matth. ii. 17.* He who reads the xxxi. ch. of *Jerem.* in the Septuagints Version, of that Edition

tion at least, which Bishop *Walton*, judging most correct, put into our Polyglott, shall find in the whole chapter nothing nearer this Text, than ver. 3. *A voice of people crying out of Oronaim, destruction and great breaking in pieces.* But in truth this was not designed by the Interpreters as a Translation of what is cited by *S. Matthew*; as belonging to *ch. 48. 3.* For here the Copy is all in confusion; and this, which stands, in order, the xxxi, is indeed the xlviii. And that which stands the xxxviii, is legitimately the xxxi. And so besides the Hebrew, and our Bibles from it, even the vulgar Latin, and some later Editions of the Septuagint, have it. Now in the said xxxviii. *chap. v. 15.* we have the text we look for, which is there rendred thus: *Rachel all in weeping,* A.

weeping [ἀποκλαιομένη, simply without any adjection : not as S. *Matt.* κλαίῃσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, which perfectly answers the Hebrew.] *and would not cease over her children, because they were not.*

A fifth Text is out of *Isai.* xl.3. where first we find S. *Matthew* to follow the Septuagints Version : But the reason may well be presumed to be, because they here
 cc. follow the Hebrew : so that in this text all three accord ; especially if we render פני in the sense our Translators very properly, as I conceive, take it. The little difference there is, is of S. *Matthew*, from both the Original and Septuagint : for he putting the Pronoun for the Noun, contracts the latter clause thus. *Make straight his paths*, instead of, *make straight the paths of our God*, which word
 אלהינו

אֱלֹהֵינוּ of our God, very material as it might seem, is in both, but omitted by S. *Matthew*.

B.

The sixth and seventh Texts, S. *Matthew* produces out of the Old Testament (if we wave one, which is mangled by the Devil, as I am apt to think it not disagreeable to do, inasmuch as his authority will not much credit any Translation) are such wherein Hebrew, Septuagint and Evangelist are all at sufficient accord. The places are *Deut.* viii. 3. and vi. 16. in S. *Matt.* iv. 4, 7.

cc.
cc.

The Eighth is, *Deut.* vi. 13. alleged by S. *Matth.* iv. 10, where both Hebrew and Septuagint (and so indeed in parallel texts) read, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God*, but S. *Matthew* glosses the word more to his purpose, and receding from both, saith, *Thou shalt*

G

shalt

- A. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God.*
 B. The Temptation was, *To fall down and worship the Tempter, v.9.* And the word *Worship*, which is comprised in the fear of God, *πρὸς τὸ φόβον*, was more pertinent to oppose to the temptation, than *φοβηθήσεται* of the Septuagint, though that more exactly answered *תִּירָא* the Original. But in the latter clause here it is to be noted, that Emphatical restrictive term, *only*, is added by the Septuagint, and not in the Original Hebrew: And the Evangelist herein follows the Septuagint, not the Hebrew: which is the first instance we meet with of this kind.

The Ninth is out of *Isai. ix. 1.* produced by *S. Matthew iv. 15.* Not to speak here of the irreconcilable difference, as it seems to me, between the Septuagint and the

the Original, in such turning aside (I will not say perverting) the very scope of that whole Paragraph, as makes the principal part of it, if taken according to the Septuagints Version unapplicable and impertinent to the Evangelists purpose, we will only view that part of it, broken off short, which our Evangelist alledges.—*The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphthali, the way of the Sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. The people which sat* [saith S. Matth. walked, Hebr.] *in darkness, have seen a great light, and to them that sat in the region* [Hebr. in the land] *of the shadow of death, light is sprung up, or, hath shined.* Thus far exactly do S. Matthew and the Hebrew agree. But the Septuagint differ thus ---*The region of Zebulun, the land of Naph-*
G 2
thali,

thali, and the rest of the inhabitants of the Sea-coast, and Galilee of the nations beyond Jordan. Behold a great light, ye people that walk in darkness, and ye that dwell in the region of the shadow of death, light shall shine upon you. Any one may perceive by the English, these Translations differ; but the Greek of S. Matthew, and of the
A. *Septuagint in this text, is much more different than the English: And S. Matthew here leaves the Septuagint, and keeps close to the Hebrew.*

In our Lord's Sermon on the mount, there are several concise old Precepts, and Doctrinal passages rather toucht and alluded to, than any intire text, that I have observed, produced. For, the Tenth and last instance therefore out of *S. Matthew* we will
take

take what he alledges, *Chap. viii.* 17. expresly, and by name, out of *Isaiah, chap. liii. 4.* which had our Translators thought good, might have been rendred word for word out of *Isaiah's* Hebrew, as they have rendred it out of *S. Matthew's* Greek. But I confess the text is capable of a double sense, and therefore they did very wisely, according to the different scopes of the Contexts, to give it a double rendring. However in *S. Matthew's* text, *Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses*; every word answers to the Hebrew. But the Septuagint have translated every word different (more pertinentely, perhaps, to the Prophets scope, than to the Evangelists) thus. *This* [person Οὗτος, not 'ΑΥΤΟΣ] *bears our sins, and is grieved concerning us.* *S. Matthew*

therefore leaves their translation, and himself, as far as we know, translates a-new.

- And now to sum up our Evidence out of *S. Matthew*: It is plain in seven Texts of Ten,
- 7 A. he forsakes the Septuagint, and in diverse of them, as all reason induces us to think, because they therein forsake the Hebrew, which he rather follows. In the other three of the Ten, we find *S. Matthew*, Hebrew and Septuagint all accord.
- 3 CC. In four of those instances wherein *S. Matthew* translates a-new, he takes that liberty which we asserted, receding in part from the very Hebrew it self, in expression, I mean, though not so much in sense. Finally, we have one instance, and that only, in one restrictive particle, which he takes out of the Septuagints Version,
- 4 B.
- 1 C.

sion, not to be found in the Hebrew, but very pertinent and emphatical to his purpose.

Therefore, I. the Authors or Pen-men of the New Testament, do not always, or with a *perpetual consent*, follow the Septuagints Version: but II. They take such Latitude or Liberty, as seemed good to the Holy Spirit of God: which were the points to be demonstrated.

CHAP. III.

Texts produced out of the Old Testament by S. Mark.

SAIN*T* *Mark* in the very be-
ginning of his Gospel, pro-
duces two Testimonies (indeed
out of two Prophets, but) so, as
G 4 they

they would seem at first sight only one continued Prophecy.

The first is out of *Malach.* iii. 1. and in the Hebrew, it runs thus. *Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare [as by ſweeping or cleaning] the way before my face.*

This the Septuagint thus render, *Behold I ſend forth my messenger, and he ſhall view the way before my face.* S. Mark paraphraſes it thus,

A. *Behold, I ſend, [Ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω, Mark. Only Ἐξαποστέλλω, Sept.] my meſſenger before thy face, who ſhall prepare thy way before thee.* A liberty

B. not only altering the words and Tranſlation, but enlarging the ſenſe at that rate, which nothing but preſent inſpiration could warrant. He follows neither Septuagint nor Hebrew.

The ſecond is the ſame with the fifth, out of S. *Matthem*, wherein
S.

S. Mark exactly agrees with his brother Evangelist; even to the use of the Pronoun, instead of the Hebrew emphatical Noun; both of them, in that minute difference, receding from Hebrew as well as Septuagint. But this difference is not sufficient to justify any mans saying, they here left the Version of the Seventy. Wherefore we will account all here agreed.

cc.

There is a glance at a passage of *Isaiah*, *Mark* iv. 12. but the text not so directly cited as in *S. John*: we will therefore defer the Examination of it, till we meet with it there. And supposing we pass that; the third text produced by *S. Mark* out of the Old Testament, as far as I have observed, is *Isai.* xxix 13. which, as to what is made use of by this
Evan-

Evangelist, runs thus, in the Hebrew. *This people — honour me with their lips, but have removed their heart from me, and their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men, as our Translators have rendred it : or, more strictly, their fear towards me, is a taught precept of men.* And in the Septuagint thus, *This people ----they honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching commandments of men, and doctrines.* This last clause indeed, *S. Mark ch. vii. 6, 7.* (we will suppose for perspicuities sake) a little alters, varying the order of the words, and omitting the conjunction (which makes no inconsiderable variation of the

B. Septuagints sense, indeed meliorates it, and is an instance of the liberty he used) thus, *Teaching for*

for doctrines [or, as Doctrines] the commandments of men. In the rest, word for word he keeps to the Septuagint, who undoubtedly, as *Grotius* well conjectures, for ורתו read, as easily they might in old Manuscripts, ורתו, and according to that reading they naturally enough rendred the text as they did, *and in vain do they worship me*: for so read, it runs word for word thus, *and in vain is their fear* [that is, *worship*] *towards me*. Then the participle διδασκαλος, teaching, was necessary to be supplied in the latter clause, (which their misreading, or otherwise reading the former, had involved) to make the construction more commodious, the sense remaining still the same.

The fourth passage is out of the Decalogue, *Exod.* xx. 12. wherein

c c. wherein all accord: only in that explicatory Supplement to this command, out of *Exod. xxi. 17.* *He that curseth father or mother;* *S. Mark ch. vii. 10.* changes the verb from the Indicative to the Imperative, and more agreeably to the stile of a Law-giver, reads *Θανάτω τελευτάτω, Let him dy the death:* but this difference is not worthy to come into account.

The fifth instance of any intire Text alledged (not to speak of places meerly referred to, or toucht upon, where it is uncertain, whether the Evangelist more ey'd the Original or Septuagint) is touching the institution of Marriage, *Mark x. 6, 7, 8.* Wherein again all three exactly accord: excepting only, that the Septuagint seem to have taken one small, but

but Emphatical word, out of the 25. *verse*, and put it into the 24. of *Genes. ii.* for they read, *They two shall be one flesh.* *Two*, is not in the Hebrew, but notwithstanding, taken from the Septuagint by our Evangelist, as being indeed very much to his purpose.

c.

The sixth instance is again in the Decalogue, and therein of the Repetition of the whole second Table, summarily, *Mark x. 19.* Now the difference herein, is greater in the Greek of these Writers, than it appears in the English: so that we may safely say, the Translation is not the same with the Septuagint. The prohibitive particle, the mood or way of speaking, all along is changed, and the order of the Precepts totally inverted. And finally, instead of the Tenth Command-

mandment, Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, *Thou shalt not covet*, in which the Septuagint exactly follow the He-

- A. brew, S. Mark has Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, *Defraud not*, or, *Deprive not*; A manifest Variation, and no doubt designed to teach us what kind of Coveting is chiefly forbid in that command, namely, the nourishing such desires as put us upon contrivances to obtain what is our Neighbours, or to get to our
- B. selves, by depriving others of their right. A passage very remarkable. And this liberty even in the very text of the Decalogue, or Moral law it self; I may say nothing, but our Lord's Authority, as the Christian Law-giver, or present inspiration could have warranted.

The seventh Testimony which S. Mark produces, we find in
Chap.

Chap. xi. 17. out of Isai. lvi. 7. and the Eighth, Chap. xii. 10. out of Psalm cxviii. 21. In both which there is no variation at all, between Hebrew, Septuagint or Evangelist. cc.
cc.

The Ninth is in *S. Mark, Chap. xii. 19.* where he expressly indeed refers to the old Law, but we cannot think by his reporting it, he lookt upon himself concern'd to produce the words of the text. That Law we find extant, *Deut. xxv. 5.* Where in the Hebrew it is, *If he have no Son*; in the Septuagint, *If he have no Seed*; In *S. Mark, If he leave no children.* And again, *ver. 7.* The office of the surviving brother is termed in the Hebrew and Septuagint, *Raising up his brothers name*, [*Ἀναστῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τῷ ἀδελφῷ.*] by *S. Mark, Raising up seed unto his brother.* [*Ἐξανα-*

[Ἐξαναγῆσαι σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ.] Indeed in an Historical relation of this custom, before it was past into a formal Law, *Genes.* xxxviii. 8. both Hebrew and Septuagint have, with a very small difference, this latter phrase. However this must be allowed a proof of the liberty he takes, to report the sense, not the words, of the Law, and so not to confine himself to any Translation.

The last instance I will alledge out of *S. Mark* is, *Chap.* xii. 26. where he repeats God's words, *Exod.* iii. 6. which in the Septuagint run thus, *I am God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob.* The Text consisting of proper names, there could not well be greater Variation, than by putting in all along the Article, which here bears a great Emphasis

sis to the purpose, for which our Lord alledged that Testimony; and that S. Mark does, reporting it thus; *I am the God* [ὁ Θεός] *of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.*

A.

So that in summ: in Ten Texts out of S. Mark, we have three, wherein the Evangelist manifestly recedes from, or alters the Septuagints Translation. We have four, wherein both, Hebrew, Septuagint, and Gospel all agree. We have two in which he may be said properly to follow the Septuagint, because he keeps to their Version, even as to what is not in the Hebrew in terms. And we have, to omit other less variations, four instances of the liberty (in two of them, very great) which he takes, in leaving both Hebrew

3 A.

4 CC.

2 C.

4 B.

H

and

and Septuagint. Whereby it is evident, the Holy Ghost did not intend, in the stile of the New Testament, to Canonize any Translation by a constant and perpetual observation of it. *Q. E. D.*

CHAP. IV.

*Texts out of the Old Testament cited
by S. Luke.*

THE first is in his First *Chap.* ver. 16, 17. where he evidently cites a Verse or two out of the Prophet *Malachi*, but with such liberty as I have asserted. The Text in the Hebrew runs thus.

thus. *Malach. iv. 5, 6. Behold I send you Elijah the Prophet.----- And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers.* The Septuagints Version in this Chapter is very disorderly, and perhaps has sustained wrong: but I shall, as justly as I can, represent their rendring these words. *Behold, I will send unto you, Elias the Tishbite.* [A very corrupt Addition, whose, or with what design, God knows. Sure it is, that the Jewish Rabbies teach, and particularly *David Kimchi* upon this very Text, that *Elias the Tishbite's* soul is to come into a body, created like the former, which he had, and that he is to appear, and call together the *Jews* from the several parts of the world immediately

before the coming of the *Messias*; Three days before, say some of them. Now how excellently the Version of the Septuagint favours this Fable, and whether this be not *παλινομαρτεῖν*, to dote with, or on, the Rabbies, as some body taxes others to do, let the world judge. The Angel, in *S. Luke*, expressly interprets the Prophecy of *S. John* the Baptists coming in the Spirit, and power of *Elias*, &c. But enough of this. The Septuagint again proceed, misinterpreting.] *Who shall restore the heart of the father to the son, and the heart of a man to his neighbour.* How strangely different from what we heard in the Prophet, and from what we find in *S. Luke's* Text! who tells us an Holy Angel spoke to *Zachary*, the father of *John* the Baptist,

con-

concerning his son, thus: *He shall go before him* [that is, John the Baptist before Christ] *in the Spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children* [ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα· strictly according to the Original. Not, ἀποκαταστήσαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱόν, as the Septuagint have ordered it.] *and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just.* A free paraphrase as to this latter clause. A.

The Second Text alledged by S. Luke, is in Chapter ii. 23. where he tells us: *It is written in the Law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord.* Now who would not expect to find this text in the Law, Hebrew or Greek, word for word? Yet is the sense only, not the words, B.

written there. *The first-born, that openeth every matrice*, as the Septuagint exactly according to the Hebrew render it [Πρωτογενὲς διανοῖγον πᾶσαν μήτραν] is commanded to be *sanctified to the Lord*. *Exodus* xiii. 1. wherefore it may be justly said, 'tis called Holy. Let us look further, and *verse* 12. we find that Law repeated as to Beasts, thus; Πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν, τὰ ἀσθενικὰ τῷ κυρίῳ. So again *verse* 15. So *Numbers* viii. 16. But the Text, as *S. Luke* reports it, and seems to say, 'tis written so, I no where find but in him. Wherefore we plainly see him use a liberty to depart from the words both of Septuagint and Hebrew.

B.

The Third indeed is of small moment, yet to be just to our proposal, we must take notice of

of it. *A pair of Turtles* [ζεύγος τρυγόνων] says *S. Luke, Chap. ii. 24. two Turtles*, say both Hebrew and Septuagint. A.

In the Fourth Text, there is a Concord betwixt all, except only in one word. What the Septuagint call Πεδία, *Plains*, nearer the Hebrew, *Isai. xl. 4. S. Luke stiles* ὁδοὶ λείας, *Chap. iii. 5. smooth ways*. I do not esteem this difference worth the accounting. C C.

In the Fifth, *S. Luke* varies a little, both from the Hebrew, and the Septuagints and *S. Matthew's* Greek. The Hebrew runs thus. *Deut. viii. 3. But upon all that proceeds out of the mouth of God, shall man live.* The Septuagint gloss it thus, *upon every word that proceeds, &c.* and *S. Matthew*, as we have seen, follows them. *S. Luke* takes it shorter, *Chap. iv. 4.*

H 4

But

But by every word of God. I esteem not this variation worth reckoning, and therefore here again account an Accord of all.

In the Sixth, I cannot but take notice of the same Variation, made by *S. Luke*, both from the Hebrew and Septuagint, which
A. S. Matthew also made, *Thou shalt*
B. worship, instead of, *Thou shalt fear*, *Luke* iv. 8. I refer my Reader to the note on *S. Matthew*.

In the Seventh, which was also the seventh out of *S. Matthew*, we find *S. Luke* to accord with the
cc. Hebrew, Septuagint and *S. Matthew*. 'Tis *Luke* iv. 12, and *Deut.* vi. 16.

The Eighth passage, has in it considerable both agreement and disagreement to the Septuagint. 'Tis *Isai.* lxi. 1, 2. Where, the Septuagint render what is in
the

the Hebrew, *The opening of the prison to them that are bound, by recovery of sight to the blind.* This so different rendring, depends upon a Criticism, in the Hebrew word פקח. *To open* [properly say the Masters, *the eyes and ears.*] However S. Luke follows it, *Chapter, iv. 18.* But withal, presently adds another rendring, which plainly shews he had the Hebrew text in his eye. *To set at liberty* [or send away] *them that are bruised.* This, I say, is not in the Septuagint, and evidently answers, though it does not strictly express, the Hebrew *Opening of the Prison to them that are bound.* So that considering both, he may be said here to have followed both Septuagint and Hebrew: taking out of the Septuagint, what was there emphatical
to

c.

to his purpose, and yet not neglecting what in the Hebrew was not so fully translated by the

B. Septuagint, but giving a gloss of it according to his liberty.

And yet again, in this text, he most plainly recedes from the Septuagint, in the very next clause, rejecting their translation

A. of נקל by καλέσαι, which was not pertinent to the scope of the text, and rendring it κηρύξαι, which is both pertinent to the scope, and strict justice to the word.

The Ninth Old Testament Text, which I have observed, produced by *S. Luke*, is the same with *S. Mark's* first: 'Tis in *Luke* vii. 27. and out of *Malachi* iii. 1.

A. The two Evangelists exactly accord, but both recede widely
E. from the Septuagint, on which
 for

for the present I make no other note than there I did.

In *Luke* viii. 10. there is a short touch upon *Isai.* vi. 9. as indeed there was in *S. Mark*: but it occurs again more largely in *S. John*: we will therefore at present wave the examination thereof; and for the Tenth Testimony produced out of the Old Testament by *S. Luke*, we will take that which next follows in him, *Chapter* x. 27. which is so much the more worthy of our notice, because it is repeated by the two former Evangelists, but our measure did not reach to it. 'Tis *Deut.* vi. 5. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy*

Heart---Soul---Might.

Mind---Soul---Power.

Hebr.

Sept.

Heart

Heart---Soul--Strength, Mind. Luc.
Heart--Soul--Mind, Strength. Mar.
Heart---Soul---Mind. Matth.

Where it is observable that our Evangelist, first, recedes from the Septuagint, as indeed do both the other, to keep with the Hebrew in the first term, *with all thine heart*. Secondly, both from the Hebrew and Septuagint in making the Scheme consist of four terms, as also doth S. Mark; whereas Originally it has but three. And thirdly, he renders מֵאָדָם by *ἡ ψυχή* not *δυνάμεις* as the Septuagint. Which are ample evidences of his not following, here, the Version of the Septuagint.

In summ, Of Ten Texts taken by S. Luke, out of the Old Testament, we find him to recede
 confi-

considerably from the Septua- 6 A.
gint, in six; in three we find him
to accord both with the Septua-
gint (though not exactly) and 3 CC.
Hebrew; In one, he neither ac-
cords with Hebrew nor Septua-
gint, as to words, but only as to
sense, taking the liberty (usual
with all Writers) of his own ex-
pression: But besides this, there
are five other instances of this li- 6 B.
berty, as to sundry members of
Texts. And there is only one in-
stance, and that in one clause of
a Text, wherein he keeps to the
Septuagint apart from the He- 1 C.
brew. Whence I presume both
our Propositions again demon-
strated.

CHAP. V.

*Texts of the Old Testament cited
by S. John.*

A. **T**HE First, *Chapter i. 23.* Here
S. *John* recedes both from
the Septuagints Version, which the
other three Evangelists exactly
followed, and from them also.
Where they all have, *Prepare ye
the way*, (*Isai. xl. 3. Matt. iii. 3.*
B. *Mark i. 3. Luk. iii. 4.*) He says,
Make ye strait the way, which was
one sort of preparing it, but
not at all, that intimated in the
Original Hebrew word.

The Second, I have observed
S. *John* to produce, is out of
Psalms

Psalms lxi. 9. which he reports,
Chapter ii. 17. exactly accord-
 ing to Hebrew and Septuagint, *cc.*
The zeal of thine house hath eaten
me up.

The third Text by him pro-
 duced (for of little glances and
 allusions no judgment can be
 made in this case) is out of *Isai.*
 liv. 13. which the Septuagint,
 supplying the Verb שמת' שמו
 (as very properly they might)
 out of *verse* 12. render, *And I will*
make --- all thy children taught of
God. This Text *S. John* thus re-
 ports, *Chap.* vi. 45. *It is written*
in the Prophets, And they shall be
all taught of God. A new Verb,
 a Pronoun for a Noun (depart-
 ing, herein, both from Hebrew
 and Septuagint) and yet the text
 brought in abruptly, as if it had
 been written in so many words
 or

- A.* or syllables, *And they, &c.* 'Tis plain, he intended not to follow the Septuagints Version, though he kept both their, and the Original sense.
- B.*

The fourth Testimony is very short, (but with such, out of this Evangelist, we must be content) from *Psalme lxxxii. 6.* produced *John x. 34. I said ye are Gods:* And herein all accord.

cc.

The fifth Testimony, I have observed, still I mean, alledged at any length by *S. John*, is out of *Zech. ix. 9.* which in the Hebrew and Septuagint runs thus : *Rejoice greatly O daughter of Sion, shout, [Proclaim, Sept.] O daughter of Jerusalem. Behold thy King cometh to thee, Just, and having Salvation [Saved, Hebr. Saving, Sept.] is he, lowly [rather poor, Hebr.] and riding upon an Ass,*
and

and upon a colt the sole of Asses,
[upon a beast accustomed to the yoke,
and a young sole, say the Sept.] This
S. John hath varied and contracted
thus. Ch. xii. 15. *Fear not daughter
of Zion, Behold thy King cometh sit-
ting upon an Asses colt.* There are
scarce three words, and those such
too as could not be varied, of the
Septuagints Greek, in the Evan-
gelists text.

†

A.

B.

The sixth Old Testament-text,
S. John has, is again a short one. 'Tis
*Isai. liii. 1. Lord who hath believed
our report? John xii. 38.* And here
all agree exactly. Indeed in a
text so short, and plain, it could
not well be otherwise. But in

c c.

The seventh, which is larger,
we shall find difference enough.
The Prophet *Esaias* said again,
saith S. John, Chap. xii. 40. *He hath
blinded their eyes, and hardened*

I

their

*their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted and I should heal them. But Isaiah's words run thus, Isai. vi. 10. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert and be healed; as our Translation, only making the Hebrew English, excellently renders them. The Septuagint varies a little from the Hebrew, turning the Imperative Active into a Passive Preter (which a small difference of punctuation does in the Hebrew) and read thus, *The heart of this people is waxed fat, and they hear heavily with their ears, and their eyes have they closed, lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears,**

ears, and understand with their heart, and should convert [or, return] and I should heal them. Which Version of the Septuagint S. Matthew follows, word for word, *Matth.* xiii. 15. So does S. Luke. *Acts* xxviii. 27. Notwithstanding it is plain, both from Hebrew, from the Septuagint, and from both those Evangelists, does S. John's text differ. 1. Whereas the text consists of two Climaxes or gradations, one answering the other, S. John cuts each short by one step. 2. The Septuagint's Version, and the Evangelists from them, impute all to the people, as their own Act or Choice. *Their heart is grown fat, they hear heavily with their ears, and they have closed their eyes.* S. John ascribes all this (following herein the Hebrew) to God and his judgment. 3. The

I 2 princi-

A.

B.

principal Greek words are in a manner all diverse. Τετύφλωκε, πε-
 πώρωκε, ιοήσωσι, saith S. John. Ὁφθαλ-
 μὲς ἐκάμυσαν ὥσὶ βαρέως ἠκυσαν συνῶσι,
 Septuagint. *Matth. Luk.* Further
 as to this Text, it is worthy our
 notice, that it is in three other
 places of the New Testament al-
 ledged, at least in part: namely
 by S. *Luke* in his Gospel, *Ch. viii.*
10. who there contracts it, and
 otherwise varies from the Septua-
 gint. By S. *Mark Chap. iv. 12.*
 who in the beginning holds with
 the Septuagint, but in the close
 instead of, *I should heal them*, puts
 paraphrastically, *and their sins*
should be forgiven them, which is
 one part of healing, leaving here-
 in Hebrew, as well as Septuagint.
 And lastly, by S. *Paul, Rom. xi. 8.*
 who glosses on it, differently from
 all, thus, *God hath given them the*
Spirit

Spirit of slumber [instead of *made their hearts fat*] eyes that they should not see, ears that they should not hear; with *S. John* and the Hebrew, attributing the Act to God. So that (to note this by the bye, though not to bring it into account) in one and the same place six times produced in the New Testament, there seems twice a new Version clearly made, viz. by *S. John* one, and by *S. Paul* another: Twice is the Old Septuagint followed by *S. Matthew*, and *S. Luke* in the Acts; but also twice again varied in a good part, the very same Evangelist in terms varying from himself; All, an ample proof of the Latitude, which is to be acknowledged in these Authors styles.

In the xv. of *S. John*, ver. 25. there is a transient and occasional

allusion to an expression *Psalms* xxxv. 19. And though I might reasonably say, the Evangelist here seems rather to have followed some other Version, or reading, than that of the Septuagint (for he produces the text as an intire Proposition, with a causal particle in its beginning, as connecting it with what, in the Original context, is supposed to have gone before, *ὅτι ἐμισήσαν με δωρεάν*. whereas it is only the subject of a Proposition, or rather of a Petition, both in our Septuagint and Hebrew) though I might, I say, take notice of this difference, yet I wave it, and as the *Eighth* Testimony produced by *S. John*, reckon that out of *Psal. xxii. 29.* touching the *souldiers dividing our Lord's garments amongst them, and casting lots upon his*

his seamless coat, alledged Chap. cc. xix. 24. wherein all agree.

Reckoning as we have done, the Ninth Old Testament-text, I observe, alledged by *S. John* is Chap. xix. 36. which whether taken out of *Exod.* xii. 36. or *Num.* ix. 2. varies considerably both in phrase and sense. *Ye shall not break a bone from off it*, in the former place: *They shall not break a bone from off it*, in the latter: But *S. John* has it, *a bone of him* [or of *A.* it, viz. of the Passeeover, a Figure of Christ crucified] *shall not be broken*. I ought not to wave this difference.

The last passage I have observed *S. John* to produce out of the Old Testament, is *Zechariah*, xii. 10. which in the Hebrew stands exactly as we have it translated to us, *They shall look upon me*

[or, to me] whom they have pierced. And S. John only varying the person of the object, reports it, *Chap. xix. 37. They shall look on him whom they have pierced.* But the Septuagint most strangely, indeed so, as not without difficulty to be reconciled with sense. Ἐπιλέψονται πρὸς [even herein not with S. John, Ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰς] μὲν, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο. Words of most ambiguous meaning, whereas the Original is most express and plain; But put what sense we can upon them, nothing can well be more foreign from the Original Prophecy and the Evangelists purpose, than they are. Some render them, *They shall look upon me, for that they have insulted.* But why Ἀνθ' ὧν, for that? If we will retain that signification of the Verb, the translation

flation would be better, *for those things wherein they have insulted, or, for those persons, over whom they have insulted*: Either is more natural than the first. However, this text was not produced as a Prophecy of the *Jews* insulting over, or scoffing at, the *Messias*, but of their piercing him. And indeed the Authors of this translation seem not to have understood the text of the *Messias* at all. For if we follow, what some men tell us is the best Edition of the Septuagint, it is not said therein, *they shall mourn over him, but over themselves*. Besides, give me leave to offer an old conjecture of the ground of all this misinterpretation. The Interpreters read undoubtedly רקרו *They danced* [*or wantonly skipped*, like Rams, as the word is used, *Psalms* CXIV.

cxiv. 4.] for רקרו *They pierced*. How easie the mistake is, any one that knows the Hebrew letters, may see. And so reading it, they could not have better translated it than as they did, κατωρχήσαντο. For though *Hezekias* render κατωρχήσαντο only by κατεχάρησαν [*they rejoiced against*] and *Suidas* adds only ἐπαιξαν [*they mocked*] both which together may make up, *They insulted*; yet is none of these the proper, much less the only, signification of that word. *Budæus*, a person of better judgment and accuracy, who also brings ever fair Vouchers for what he says, proves κατορχεῖσθαι is to *Dance deliciously* to the pleasing and transport of the Spectators, or else *Mimically and reproachfully*. The former of these I take to have

have been designed by the Interpreters, as being the more usual signification of the word. The Jewish Doctors, we must know, have a saying, that in all the Plagues which beset their Nation, since their forefathers guilt in the matter of the Golden Calf, there are still some grains of the Ashes of that Calf in them. Now I verily believe, the Interpreters, in the rendring this text, reflected upon those Idolatrous sports of the old *Jews* (as being leavened with the aforesaid Doctrine) and understood it to be a Prophecy of a deep National humiliation for that National sin in the Wilderness, *Exod. xxxii.* Thus then I judge their Greek text here ought to be rendred, *They shall look upon me for what they Danced,* that is, for their
Lewd

Lewd dancing, and voluptuous sports and solemnities before their Idol, when they held that Feast, wherein *They sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.* And thus we have a Prophecy of the *Jews* repentance, for Crucifying the *Messiah*, perverted to the occasion (as I conceive) of the Golden Calf, by the misreading of the Interpreters. Misreading, I said; for that they did herein misinterpret is plain, else *S. John* misinterprets; and I think no better account can be given of their misinterpreting, than that which I have supposed, from *S. Hierom*, of their misreading. But if any will make better sense of their text, I shall be glad to hear it. I am sure if any text, which so peculiarly touches the proof of Christianity as this does,

does, had been so awkwardly read in the Hebrew, we should have heard largely of Rabbinical corruptions, and malicious frauds of the Modern *Jews*.

But it is time to sum up our account here also. Of Ten Texts, which are all this Evangelist has (as far as I have observed) of any tolerable length, whence to judge of a translation; of ten, I say, he leaves the Septuagint translation in six: and in four of these six, takes the liberty we have asserted, of departing from the strict expressions as well of Hebrew as Septuagint. In the other four texts, indeed he follows both Hebrew and Septuagint. But there is not any one instance, I have been able to observe, in this Evangelist, wherein he follows the Septuagint alone,

6 A.

4 B.

4 CC.

alone, that is, receding from the Hebrew Original text. Wherefore I conceive both the Propositions again evidenced by these deductions out of S. *John*.

CHAP. VI.

The Summ of all the Accounts.

TO draw all the Accounts now into one. Of forty Texts out of the Old Testament, the Evangelists have clearly departed from the Septuagint and translated a-new in twenty two; generally keeping closer to the Hebrew than the Septuagint does.

In

In diverse of these Twenty two, as well as in others particularly notified, to the number of Eighteen in all, they have taken the Latitude we asserted, varying from the expression of the Hebrew, as well as of the Septuagint, and contenting themselves to report the general sense of the Testimonies they produce. 18 B.

Which Summ of Instances being found, within so small a compass, amply proves both the Propositions above asserted, but not needful here to be repeated.

Further it appears, there are Fourteen texts of the Forty, wherein Hebrew, Septuagint, and Evangelists all accord. 14 CC.

Again, There are Four in which the Evangelists have followed

4^C. lowed the Septuagint, singly at least, as to some expression, or expressions, which are not, or seem not to be in the Hebrew: which expressions that it may appear justly of what moment they are, though they are before set down a-part, and as they did occur, yet I will here repeat them together.

Matt. iv. 10. Him [only] shalt thou serve.

Mark vii. 7. [Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching commandments of men, and Doctrines. Sept. Teaching for Doctrines the commandment of men. Mark] This is only thus far virtually in the Hebrew Text. *Their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men. [in vain do they worship me]* is an Addition of the Septuagint,

gint, not in the Hebrew, crept in by mis-reading, though agreeable enough to the scope of the text: but followed by *S. Matthem*, as well as *Mark*. *Mark* x. 8. *They* [two] *shall be one flesh*.

Luke iv. 18. *Recovery of sight to the blind*. This is virtually in the Hebrew. For פתח which we render *opening*, signifies properly the *opening of the eyes*, or *ears*, (as before said) in which, say the Hebrew Criticks, it differs from פה which signifies the *opening of the mouth*: but *S. Luke*, as we have seen, to be sure of expressing the full Hebrew sense, both takes the restrained translation of the Septuagint, which would emphatically touch some of our

K Lords

Lord's Miracles; and adds a more general one of his own. For we found he there receded from the Septuagints, as well as they from the Hebrew expressions. Thus far then, only, in these forty Texts, the Evangelists have departed from the Hebrew, to hold with the Vulgar Greek Translation then in the hand of the Grecising *Jews*.

5† Lastly, There are five Texts of the number of those, wherein the Evangelists have left the Septuagint clearly, and held with the Hebrew, in which the Septuagint have so distorted or perverted the sense, that had the Evangelists reported them, as the Septuagint rendred them, they would have

have proved Testimonies rather against the Truth than for it. At least there would have been so many Testimonies lost. It would be too tedious here to repeat them.

CHAP. VII.

Observations upon the former Account, and the Conclusion.

AND now things ly thus before us, a man would think we might be able to see in a manner into the depth of this mighty pretended accord of the Evangelists, so peculiarly, with

the Septuagint, and what Authority it derives to the Septuagint, or detracts from the Hebrew: In which, that we may proceed with as clear and demonstrative evidence as we can, let me premit, by way of *POSTULATA*, what I think all the world cannot deny.

I. Forasmuch as it cannot be reputed a meerly casual and accidental Act in the Evangelists, that they thus or thus report any Text out of the Old Testament; therefore their receding from, or agreeing with the Septuagint, was with design, or an Act of deliberation and choice.

II. Their great design in Allegation of Testimonies out of the Old Testament, being to assert and prove Christian Truth, especially to the *Jews*, therefore as
it

it was rational when they saw any Emphasis or Advantage more in the Septuagint, than in the Hebrew (because the Septuagint was commonly known, and sacredly received by the Jews) to use it as an *Argumentum ad homines*, to their purpose : so if at any time we find the Hebrew text to serve more to their purpose than the Septuagint, and them to have followed the Hebrew text, leaving the Septuagint, we cannot but conclude in such case they designedly left the Septuagint, as less comports with the Christian Truth, and kept to the Hebrew, as being therein more firm and favourable to Christianity.

Now from hence it must follow (which I advance as my

K 3

First

First Proposition, in order to making a clear estimate of the Accord of the Evangelists and Apostles with the Septuagint, and so of the Authority as well of the Hebrew text, and the Translations from it, as of the Septuagints Version.) From hence, I say, it must follow, that where the Hebrew text and the Septuagints perfectly agreeing, the Evangelists keep to the Septuagint, for as much as it appears by what was last premitted, they would not have kept thereto, had the Hebrew made more for their purpose ; that therefore it is not the Septuagint, absolutely, which is in such case observed or kept to, but the Septuagint as agreeing with the Hebrew. That is, the Evangelists in those fourteen Texts, wherein they agree both
with

with Hebrew and Septuagint, principally eyed the Hebrew as most Authentick, that is, the Hebrew is principally Authentick.

Secondly, I say further, whether the Evangelists accord with the Septuagint, or translate anew from the Hebrew, they generally confirm the Hebrew text, as Original and Authentick. For of the Forty texts above examined, there are 22. in which the Evangelists having left the Septuagint, and either in exact expression, or in general sense, or in both, kept to the Hebrew, have confirmed the Hebrew *against* the Septuagint. And there are 14. in which the Septuagint agreeing with the Hebrew, it comes to pass that the Evangelists

K 4

agree

agree with both: in which therefore the Evangelists have confirmed the Hebrew *with* the Septuagint. That is, in 36. Texts of forty; that is, generally, the Evangelists rendring confirms the Hebrew.

Thirdly, I fear not to advance further, and say, the Evangelists agreement or accord with the Septuagint, yea, even wherein the Septuagint seem to go by themselves, without or from the Hebrew, does not take off the Authority of the Hebrew in those very Texts. For in two of them, *viz.* *Matth.* iv. 10. and *Mark* x. 8. There are only two new Emphases, as I may call them, added to the old Text. And in the other two, namely in *Mark* vii. 7. and *Luke* iv. 18. as, in the former, there

there was one word, viz. וְתָהִי, which was easily mis-read וְתָהִי, and so mis-rendred, (yet not so as to alter the main sense or scope of the Text) so in the other, there was a word capable of two senses; Now *S. Luke* gives both, one from the Septuagint, another of his own accord. But as he who makes any argument fuller and clearer, by varying the terms, still keeping to the main sense, or by unfolding all the force which a word of manifold signification bears, or by inserting some new Emphatical term, which shall more press the Adversary, takes not off the Validity of that Argument; so neither doth the Evangelists thus using or managing Texts of the Old Testament, with all the Emphases, which either by the Septuagints or their own

own rendring them, at all detract from the Original Hebrew, which both only improve. Had the Septuagint contradicted the Hebrew, and the Evangelists, in such contradictions, kept with them, the case had been otherwise. But the main Doctrine and sense being the same still, by this following the Septuagint, there is no impeachment at all of the Hebrew.

Fourthly, On the other side, I do and must affirm, the Septuagints receding from the Original Hebrew does derogate from the authority of the Septuagint. For, (1.) It is plain the Evangelists, in the instances brought, generally leave the Septuagint, where they leave the Hebrew. Now as the Evangelists use of the Septuagint,

is

is the great Mean which conciliates Authority to the Septuagint; so their departing from the Septuagints Version, to keep with the Hebrew, derogates. (2.) It appears, by the deduction of Particulars, that the present Version of the Septuagint hath in forty Testimonies out of the Old Testament perverted five important (and some of the most considerable) Prophecies, relating to the proof, that Jesus Christ is the true Messias. A greater derogation from its authority cannot be conceived, except in multiplying instances of that kind.

Fifthly, The proof of Christianity more relies upon the Hebrew Text, than on the Septuagints Version. For it appears, the Evangelists, who deliver the
Doctrine

Doctrine thereof unto us, make more use of the Hebrew Text; diverse Prophecies, by the Septuagint distorted and mangled, are in the Hebrew intire and direct to our purpose; and though we should suppose, as verily I believe, that the Evangelists being to write in Greek, did, to render their writings more unexceptionable to the *Jews*, follow, as much as they could, the *Jews* Greek Translation, that is, the Septuagint; yet we find in several Prophecies of the greatest moment, as well as in other points, they could not follow them, and be true to their own Cause.

Sixthly, It does not appear by any thing we have examined, that any corruption, or the least escape, can be affixt to the Hebrew

brew text. It marvelously comports with the Evangelists Greek. As to the great objection from *Psalms* xxii. 16. that we have there כָּאֵרִי *As a Lion*, for כָּאֵרִי *they pierced*, in which, say they, the Septuagint has set us right: besides that, even *P. Simon* himself, in his late *Disquisitions*, confesses כָּאֵרִי is in the very Text, or is the *Ketib* in some antient Copies, 'tis enough to me if it were but the *Keri*, or Marginal reading. But I think more cannot be desired for satisfaction, and in ample vindication of the Hebrew, than the great *Dr. Hammond* has given us upon that Psalm.

Lastly, In the Septuagints Version it is apparent, there must be acknowledged gross Errors. Five places are above marked and assigned,

assigned, where we must say, either the Evangelists have erred, or the Septuagint: and I have found no one yet so hardy as to cast the Errours on the Evangelists, *ergo*, &c.

Those, whom what I have said, may a little surprise, finding things thus notoriously otherwise than some have asserted, and haply themselves too thought, may be ready to ask, what those Asserters have to say for themselves in case of these, and such other Prophecies, thus being perverted rather than translated.

My design permits me not to take notice of all: Let it suffice to represent and animadvert upon their chief answers. “It is not
“to be denied, say some of them,
“but that the books of the Septuagint are in many places [*In-*
“*quinati*

“*quinati & interpolati*] corrupted
“and vamped with the Versions
“of *Symmachus, Theodotion, &c.*
At another time, *Septuaginta Interpretes sic vertisse stultum est existimare.* “’Tis a silly thing to
“imagine the Seventy thus rendered. And as to that very Prophecy of *Zech. xii.* “Whether
“these Errours came in, out of
“*Aquila, &c.* or any other, or by
“casual misreading, ’tis needless
“to enquire. It is enough to say,
“the Septuagint undoubtedly
“rendred it otherwise.

These answers, or defences, are perhaps more wonderful than the first assertions. The Septuagint, say they, did not translate thus, ’Tis a silly thing to think they did. But the best Copies of the Septuagint, extant, do contain and exhibit these Translations.

In

In S. *Jerom's* days the Septuagints Version had κατωρχήσαντο, or ὠρχήσαντο. *Hieronym. in loc.* They who at this time of day shall contradict S. *Jerome*, and say, he had only *vitiatum & interpolatum Codicem*, a corrupt and interlined book, when he elsewhere tells us he had *Origen's Hexapla* corrected by himself according to the best Copy; They, who to boot, shall, when they list, that is, when they are not able to defend the Septuagints Version, reject all the Copies of that Version which passes every where for the Septuagints, and say, 'tis a silly thing to believe in this or that, it is the Septuagints, when in another breath, they shall cry up the very worst Copy of the Septuagint, far above all other Translations, and even the Original it self,

self, are indeed persons to be admired, but I will not say, for what. Only I will desire them, if they expect to be believed, to bring better Proofs than they have done, that is, than their own Word and Scorn.

But to wave what I might say more largely of this nature, I only reply, I accept the Answer. Behold then, good Reader, how excellently we are helpt up by those, who reject the Hebrew text, and all Translations from it. What, will they reject all Scripture? some of them would be at that, if they durst; but they'll tell you, By no means. What then will they set up instead of the Hebrew? The Septuagints Version. Who now would not expect, that this were most perfect, subject to no various readings,

ings, much less corruptions or interpolations. No such matter; besides infinite various readings, these books are corrupted in many places, interpolate with the Versions of *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, *Aquila*, and God knows what others. This is their own confession. Again, they are Books, which they will deny at their own pleasure. Lastly, Books, which if we will believe the Holy Evangelists, have in them many gross Errours, inconsistent with the very History, as well as Doctrine, of the Gospel, and which, as has been proved, the Evangelists could not have followed, and together have been faithful to their Cause.

To conclude all: We have seen the Assertion of a *perpetual*, or even *general Agreement* of the
Pen-

Pen-men of the New Testament with the Septuagint to be groundless and false: boldly advanced by some, and too credulously taken up by others. (S. Paul perhaps, a Person more conversant with the Hellenists, mostly used the Septuagint, though not constantly: others much less.) Contrarily to the aforementioned Assertion, The present Hebrew text is confirmed by the Evangelists Versions and agreement with it; it is not impeached by their very recessions or siding with the Septuagint: it stands therefore above blemish. The Text of the Septuagint, besides its disorders, confusions and mutilations (which we might have said much more of) departs many times grossly from the truth: It is indeed the Antientest and most honourable Version; it

gives excellent light and confirmation in most things to the truth, but it is many times, as said, unhappy. Perhaps it has been purer than it is; yet above these thirteen hundred years, it is sure, it has had some of those gross Errours in it, which we find at this day remaining; and we cannot always hold to it, and together hold to the Gospel. The proof of Christianity chiefly, and in some points (as to Testimony) solely relies on the Hebrew Text; In which, by all those passages, which have been examined, it does not appear that there is any defect, errour, or so much as rational pretence of any depravation.

Upon the whole then it remains, That we *adore and magnifie the Providence of our good God, in restoring*

restoring to lost mankind in general, *the knowledge of God and themselves*, when they had extinguisht that given by natural Reason, in *preserving* to us in particular, the *Original Oracles of Salvation* so intire as we see they are, in *raising up to us Persons* so exquisitely *skilled and verst in them*, as of old, so especially within these two last Centuries, by whose indefatigable labours we have many admirable *Translations* of those Oracles into the *common speech of each Nation*; to none of which *Translations*, blessed be the same good God, is our last *English* one inferiour: That therefore we *keep close to these*, and stand *unshaken in our Faith*, not suffering our selves to be imposed upon by the Cavils, and subtle Sophisms of some, or the specious
pre-

pretences, of more Necessaries than we find in Scripture, from others; nor lastly, by a third sorts pompous ostentation of Learning. Truly, these last seem to have written, only to shew the World, how plausibly they can maintain the most mischievous Paradoxes.

I had many more things to have said: especially, as to that objection of the loss of the true old Hebrew speech. I could shew, the same pretences of reason may be brought for the loss of the old Greek, nay, even of the old Latin it self. In all *dead Tongues* the true antient Pronunciation, in process of time, must needs be lost; often also the first, and true signification of many words, whence words must necessarily grow equivocal or ambiguous, &c.

Now

Now it would be thought very extravagant to say upon these reasons, the old Greek and Latin are both lost. We dote if we say we have either. Let the same Plea be admitted for the old Hebrew. These and other things I thought once to have discours'd of in this *Appendix*. But it is much swoln already, and I conceive I have said enough to settle such, who may be shaken, but are desirous of satisfaction: And as to Scepticks, or men of an Inveterate Faction, I have not such thoughts of my self, as that I am able to recover them.

Post-

POSTSCRIPT.

THESE notes ought to have been written in a Language more befitting Criticisms of this nature. But the reason they speak plain *English*, is, because they are opposed, for the main, to Books, which are made to speak *English*. More Texts also should have been examined, and the search of these carried further. Both may be done in time, if God give leisure, and it appear this Essay does any good. In the meanwhile, the Candid Reader will take notice, I deal with the People, whom I thought, next to Truth and Plainness, which I have sacredly observed, I could gratifie in nothing more than brevity. God bless all to the end designed.

F I N I S

POSTSCRIPT.

THESE notes ought to have been written in a Language more befitting Criticisms of this nature. But the reason they speak plain *English*, is, because they are opposed, for the main, to Books, which are made to speak *English*. More Texts also should have been examined, and the search of these carried further. Both may be done in time, if God give leisure, and it appear this Essay does any good. In the mean while, the Candid Reader will take notice, I deal with the People, whom I thought, next to Truth and Plainness, which I have sacredly observed, I could gratifie in nothing more than brevity. God bless all to the end designed.

F I N I S